



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,417	12/05/2003	Todd D. Wakefield	03760.013/5130 P	8374
7590	05/31/2006		EXAMINER	
Parsons Behle & Latimer Suite 1800 201 South Main Street Salt Lake City, UT 84111				CAO, PHUONG THAO
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2164		

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/729,417	WAKEFIELD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/04 & 1/7/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 12/05/2003.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed by Applicant on 03/08/2004 and 01/07/2005 have been received and considered. Copies of the reviewed IDS(s) are enclosed with this office action.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

Art Unit: 2164

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 16-27 and 32 of copending Application No. 10/729,889. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11, 16-27 and 32 of the copending application teach all the limitations of claims 1-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Claims 1-12 and 14-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 and 13 of copending

Art Unit: 2164

Application No. 10/729,414. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11 and 13 of the copending Application teach all limitations of claims 1-12 and 14-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

7. Claims 1-12 and 14-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 16, 34-43 and 48 of copending Application No.10/729,883. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11, 16, 34-43 and 48 of the copending application teach all limitations of claims 1-12 and 14-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1-10, 12 and 14-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10, 12, 15-24 and 26 of copending Application No. 10/729,888. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-10, 12, 15-24 and 26 of the copending application teach all limitations of claims 1-10, 12 and 14-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 2164

9. Claims 1-12 and 14-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 16, 33-42 and 47 of copending Application No. 10/728,721. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11, 16, 33-42 and 47 of the copending application teach all limitations of claims 1-12 and 14-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Claims 1-12 and 14-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 13, 28-37 and 39 of copending Application No. 10/729,388. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11, 13, 28-37 and 39 of the copending application teach all the limitations of claims 1-12 and 14-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

11. Claims 1-12 and 14-24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 13, 16-25 and 27 of copending Application No. 10/729,864. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-11, 13, 16-25 and 27 of the

Art Unit: 2164

copending application teach all the limitations of claims 1-12 and 14-24 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

12. Claims 1, 13 and 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 10 of copending Application No. 10/729,833. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 10 of the copending application teach all the limitations of claims 1, 13 and 14 of the instant application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Objections

13. Claims 17 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities: “said performing” is considered as “performing” in claim 17 and “new database” is considered as “the new database” in claim 22. Appropriate correction is required.

14. Claims 7 and 20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 5 and 18, respectively. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is

Art Unit: 2164

proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

15. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

16. Regarding claims 1-4, 11, 12, 14-17 and 24, these claims recite the process of integrating mixed format data, but fails to recite a tangible result, a requirement for compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in view of the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, published on 26 October 2005, which can be found at

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ola/preognote/guidelines101_20051026.pdf>, particularly with respect to ANNEX IV Computer-Related Nonstatutory Subject Matter, beginning on page 50.

For a result to be tangible, it must be more than just a thought or a computation; it must have real-world value rather than an abstract result. For instance, note that the limitations of claims 5-10 and 18-23 are not rejected, since they recite the function of producing a new database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating, whereas (for instance), claim 1 merely cites 'integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data' as the result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

17. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

18. Claims 1,2, 4, 6, 11-15, 17, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771).

As to claim 1, Haug et al. teach:

“A computer program product located to one or more storage media devices usable to perform integration of mixed format data” (see Abstract and [column 5, lines 5-20]), said computer program product comprising instructions executable by a computer to perform the functions of:

“accessing a database of structured data, the structured data comprising a set of data tuples” (see [column 5, lines 10-20 and 33-36] wherein data in a table such as the type of patient and the type of physician are equivalent to Applicant’s “structured language” and rows in a table represent a set of data tuples as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“accessing a source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text relatable to the data tuples of the structured data” (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 20-30] wherein a column in the table as disclosed in which a free-text description of the reason for admission for

Art Unit: 2164

each specific patient is stored is equivalent to Applicant's "source of unstructured data" and the disclosure of obtaining free-text information must include accessing its source as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"interpreting the free text to produce a set of construed data reflecting at least one relational fact conveyed in the free text, each construed datum relatable to a data tuple of the structured data" (see [column 5, lines 20-35 and 40-67] and [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "constrained data", and each interpretive ICD9 code related to the patient record through a patient id [column 6, lines 1-3]); and

"integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data" (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "produced data", patient record is equivalent to Applicant's "data tuples of the structured data", and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 code to the patient record is equivalent the integrating as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said accessing a source of unstructured data accesses unstructured textual data contained within the database of structured data" (see [column 5, lines 5-20] discloses that free-text description of the reason for admission (unstructured data) is stored in the same table in a local database as other patient information such as the type of patient, patient id and the type of physician (structured data)).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

“wherein said instructions are further executable to perform the function of applying caseframes while performing said interpreting the free text” (see [column 5, lines 40-65] wherein a syntactic parsetree as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “caseframes”).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

“wherein said instructions are further executable to perform the function of inserting the produced data into the database of structured data while performing said integrating the produced data” (see [column 6, lines 1-15] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “produced data”, patient record is equivalent to Applicant’s “structured data”, and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 record to the patient record on the HELP system implies the inserting the produced data as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

Art Unit: 2164

“a processing unit coupled to said one or more storage media devices, said processing unit being capable of executing said instructions” (see [column 4, lines 40-60] wherein computer 100 or computer system 104 is equivalent to Applicant’s “processing unit”); and

“an execution command unit, whereby operation of said instructions and said processing unit may be commanded or controlled” (see [column 4, lines 50-65] wherein the operating system is equivalent to Applicant’s “execution command unit”).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

“wherein the integrated data produced by the performance of said integrating the produced data includes reference information to the original free text for construed data” (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “construed data” and the disclosure of getting a list of patient admissions from the preceding day along with the free-text and the ICD9 code implies there must include some reference information to the original free text as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language to be able to get the original free-text and the corresponding ICD9 code together as disclosed).

As to claim 13, Haug et al. teach:

“A computer program product located to one or more storage media devices usable to perform integration of mixed format data” (see Abstract and [column 5, lines 5-20]), said computer program product comprising instructions executable by a computer to perform the functions of:

Art Unit: 2164

“accessing a database of structured data, the structured data comprising a set of data tuples” (see [column 5, lines 10-20 and 33-36] wherein data in a table such as the type of patient and the type of physician are equivalent to Applicant’s “structured language” and rows in a table represent a set of data tuples as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“accessing a source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text relatable to the data tuples of the structured data” (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 20-30] wherein a column in the table as disclosed in which a free-text description of the reason for admission for each specific patient is stored is equivalent to Applicant’s “source of unstructured data” and the disclosure of obtaining free-text information must include accessing its source as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“interpreting the free text to produce a set of construed data reflecting at least one relational fact conveyed in the free text, each construed datum relatable to a data tuple of the structured data” (see [column 5, lines 20-35 and 40-67] and [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “constrained data”, and each interpretive ICD9 code related to the patient record through a patient id [column 6, lines 1-3]);

“integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data, said integrating retaining reference information to the original free text” (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “produced data”, patient record is equivalent to Applicant’s “data tuples of the structured data”, and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 code to the patient record is equivalent the integrating as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language; also the disclosure of getting a list of patient admissions from the preceding day along with the free-text and the ICD9 code implies there must retain reference

Art Unit: 2164

information to the original free text as illustrated in Applicant's claim language to be able to get the original free-text and the corresponding ICD9 code together as disclosed); and
“constructing a library containing extracted roles” (see [column 5, lines 20-35], [column 7, lines 55-67] and [column 8, lines 1-20] wherein discrete concepts is equivalent to Applicant's “extracted roles”, and memory storing a set of discrete concepts is equivalent to Applicant's “library containing extracted roles”).

As to claim 14, Haug et al. teach:

“A method for integrating mixed format data” (see Abstract and [column 5, lines 5-20]), said computer program product comprising instructions executable by a computer to perform the functions of:

“accessing a database of structured data, the structured data comprising a set of data tuples” (see [column 5, lines 10-20 and 33-36] wherein data in a table such as the type of patient and the type of physician are equivalent to Applicant's “structured language” and rows in a table represent a set of data tuples as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

“accessing a source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text relatable to the data tuples of the structured data” (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 20-30] wherein a column in the table as disclosed in which a free-text description of the reason for admission for each specific patient is stored is equivalent to Applicant's “source of unstructured data” and the disclosure of obtaining free-text information must include accessing its source as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

“interpreting the free text to produce a set of construed data reflecting at least one relational fact conveyed in the free text, each construed datum relatable to a data tuple of the structured data” (see [column 5, lines 20-35 and 40-67] and [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “constrained data”, and each interpretive ICD9 code related to the patient record through a patient id [column 6, lines 1-3]); and

“integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data” (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “produced data”, patient record is equivalent to Applicant’s “data tuples of the structured data”, and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 code to the patient record is equivalent the integrating as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

“wherein said accessing a source of unstructured data accesses unstructured textual data contained within the database of structured data” (see [column 5, lines 5-20] discloses that free-text description of the reason for admission (unstructured data) is stored in the same table in a local database as other patient information such as the type of patient, patient id and the type of physician (structured data)).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Art Unit: 2164

Haug et al. teach:

“wherein said performing said interpreting the free text applies caseframes” (see [column 5, lines 40-65] wherein a syntactic parsetree as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant’s “caseframes”).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

“further comprising the step of inserting the produced data into the database of structured data” (see [column 6, lines 1-15] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “produced data”, patient record is equivalent to Applicant’s “structured data”, and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 record to the patient record on the HELP system implies the inserting the produced data as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 24, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

“wherein the integrated data produced by the performance of said integrating the produced data includes reference information to the original free text for construed data” (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant’s “construed data” and the disclosure of getting a list of patient admissions from the preceding day along with the free-text and the ICD9 code implies there must include some reference information to the original

Art Unit: 2164

free text as illustrated in Applicant's claim language to be able to get the original free-text and the corresponding ICD9 code together as disclosed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Chen et al. (Publication No US 2003/0149586).

As to claims 3 and 16, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 14, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. do not teach "wherein said accessing a source of unstructured data and said accessing a database of structured data access two separate data source".

Chen et al. teach "wherein said accessing a source of unstructured data and said accessing a database of structured data access two separate data sources" (see [0049] and [0154] for the disclosure of deriving information from more than one information source; also see [0141] and [0142]).

Art Unit: 2164

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. by the teaching of Chen et al., since accessing unstructured data and accessing structured data from different sources provides an efficient way to combine information from different systems comprised in a complex operational environment for tracking and analyzing activities (see Chen et al., [0141] and [0142]).

21. Claims 5, 7-8, 18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771) as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (US Patent No 6,052,693).

As to claims 5 and 18, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 14, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. do not teach “producing a new database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating”.

Smith et al. teach “producing a new database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating” (see Abstract, [column 2, lines 62-67], [column 3, lines 65-67], [column 4, lines 1-25], and [column 16, lines 10-40]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. by the teaching of Smith et al., since producing a new database containing the integrated data provides an additional and effective way to store and manipulate the data without changing the database schema of the present database system.

Art Unit: 2164

As to claims 7 and 20, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 14, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. do not teach “creating a new database while performing said integrating the produced data”.

Smith et al. teach “creating a new database while performing said integrating the produced data” (see Abstract, [column 2, lines 62-67], [column 3, lines 65-67], [column 4, lines 1-25], and [column 16, lines 10-40]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. by the teaching of Smith et al., since creating a new database while performing said integrating the produced data provides an additional and effective way to store and manipulate the data without changing the database schema of the present database system.

As to claims 8 and 21, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 7 and 20, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. as modified teach “to produce a new relational database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating” (see Haug et al., [column 5, lines 5-20] wherein the disclosure of table in a local database implies relational database, and Smith et al., Abstract).

22. Claims 9-10 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771) in view of Smith et al. (US Patent No 6,052,693) as

Art Unit: 2164

applied to claims 7 and 20 above, and further in view of Chen et al. (Publication No US 2003/0149586).

As to claims 9 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 7 and 20, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. as modified does not teach “produce a file containing the integrated data produced by said integrating” (claim 9) and “wherein new database includes at least one file containing the integrated data produced by said integrating” (claim 22).

Chen et al. teach “produce a file containing the integrated data produced by said integrating” and “wherein new database includes at least one file containing the integrated data produced by said integrating” (see [0008], [0050], [0146] and [0149] wherein template is a file or database containing the integrated data as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. as modified by the teaching of Chen et al., since producing or including a file containing the integrated data provide an effective way to communicate data from one system to another system (see Chen et al., [0146]).

As to claims 10 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 9 and 22, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. as modified does not teach “produce a file having a format selected from the group of XML (or XML file), character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structures” (claim 10) and “wherein the new database has a format selected from the

Art Unit: 2164

group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structures" (claim 23).

Chen et al. teach "produce a file having a format selected from the group of XML (or XML file), character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structures" and "wherein the new database has a format selected from the group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structure" (see [0049], [0146]-[0149] wherein template file is equivalent to Applicant's "file" and "new database").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. as modified by the teaching of Chen et al., since adding the feature of new database or file having a format selected from the group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structure provides the system with effective and flexible choices for storing, manipulating and communicating the data.

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Saldanha et al. (Publication No US 2003/0167266) teach a method and system for converting plain text into structured data.

Alpha et al. (US Patent No 6,980,976) teach a method and system to built an combined index of the structured and unstructured data columns.

Saffer et al. (US Patent No 6,718,336) teach a data import system enabling access to data of multiple types from multiple data sources of different format and providing an interface for importing data into a data analysis system. The processing of a data set may include merging a first and second data set to produce the final data representation and transforming a text string to a series of attributes.

Mohan et al. (US Patent No 6,970,881) teach a method and system for analyzing and categorizing unstructured data such that conventional structured data access techniques can be utilized over unstructured data objects.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PTC

May 17, 2006

Quyen Pham
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167